

## **REMARKS**

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejection and further examination are requested.

Initially, it is noted that the country designations in the Foreign Patent Documents section of Form PTO-892 are incorrect. The country designation should be WO, FR, and JP for Easterflow, Gumery, and Yoshida, respectively. Appropriate correction is respectfully requested.

The drawings have been amended to reflect that Figures 50A-52 are prior art. Figures 13 and 14 have been amended to show the individual partitioning recesses as item 17 in the drawings. In addition, the specification has been amended to recite the individual partitioning recesses as item 17.

Claims 17-19, 24-25, and 30 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter contained therein.

### **Rejection under 35 U.S.C §102(b):**

Claims 16 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C §102(b) as being anticipated by Atake (JP Pub. 11-099536). This rejection is respectfully traversed and submitted to be inapplicable to the claims as amended for the following reasons.

Independent claim 16 is patentable over Atake because claim 16 recites a manufacturing method for an injection-molded and in-mold decorated article including, in part, discharging part of a molding resin from a product molding space into a resin-discharging-use molding space as the molding resin continues to flow radially outward from the gate portion, wherein the resin-discharging-use molding space is formed adjacent to at least part of the product molding space. This feature is beneficial because the molding resin does not collide with itself in the product molding space, causing resin burn. Instead, if the resin does collide, it will be in the resin-discharging-use molding space. Also, any gases that would form imperfections in a molded article will be pushed to the resin-discharging-use molding space and therefore not affect the molded product. Atake fails to disclose or suggest the features of claim 16 discussed above.

Atake discloses an injection-molding method with simultaneous decorating. Figures 2 and 3 shows several barricade stops 41-46 formed between the cavity 13 and the suction groove 16. Within the suction groove 16 are numerous vacuum holes 17. These vacuum holes 17 in the suction groove 16 hold a decorating sheet S in place. (See paragraph 51.) The barricade stops 41-46 are located between the cavity 13 and the suction groove 16 in order to prevent any resin from getting in the vacuum holes 17 of the suction groove 16 in the event of a fracture in the sheet S near location X. (See paragraph 61.) This way resin gets caught in the barricade stops 41-46 and is easily removed. (See paragraph 62.)

Thus, during normal operation, no resin flows into the barricade stops 41-46. Only when the sheet S is broken, melted, etc. does the resin flow into the barricade stops 41-46. Therefore, Atake does not disclose using a radially outward flow of molding resin and a resin discharge space to prevent imperfections in molded products. Therefore, Atake does not disclose or suggest discharging part of a molding resin from a product molding space into a resin-discharging-use molding space as the molding resin continues to flow radially outward from the gate portion, wherein the resin-discharging-use molding space is formed adjacent to at least part of the product molding space as recited in claim 16. As a result, claim 16 is not anticipated by Atake.

Claim 20 is dependent on independent claim 16. Therefore, claims 16 and 20 are patentable over Atake.

#### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C §103(a):**

Claims 17-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Atake (JP Pub. 11-099536) in view of Yoshida (JP Pub. 2000-117786). Claims 17-19 have been cancelled.

Claim 21 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Atake (JP Pub. 11-099536) in view of in view of Gumery (FR 2729886). This rejection is respectfully traversed and submitted to be inapplicable to claim 21 for the following reasons.

Claim 21 is ultimately dependent on claim 16, which is discussed in detail above.

Gumery is relied upon in the rejection as disclosing that paint is injected into a mold

before the part has completely solidified. However, it is apparent Gumery fails to disclose or suggest the feature lacking from Atake discussed above with regard to independent claim 16. Furthermore, Gumery does not disclose reducing the capacity of the molding space after filling the molding space with molding resin, as recited in claim 21. Accordingly, no obvious combination of Atake and Gumery would result in, or otherwise render obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the features recited in claims 16 or 21. Therefore, claim 21 is patentable over the combination of Atake and Gumery.

Claim 22 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Atake (JP Pub. 11-099536) in view of in view of Easterflow (WO 9513177). This rejection is respectfully traversed and submitted to be inapplicable to the claims for the following reasons.

Claim 22 is dependent on claim 16, which is discussed in detail above.

Easterflow is relied upon in the rejection as disclosing a method in which plastic material is initially injected into a mold cavity, and then the parts of the mold are moved in a way that leaves a gap into which paint can then be injected. However, it is apparent Easterflow fails to disclose or suggest the feature lacking from Atake discussed above with regard to independent claim 16. Furthermore, Easterflow does not disclose injecting molding resin while the mold is open and subsequently clamping the mold in order to reduce the molding space, thereby compressing the molding resin, as recited in claim 22. Accordingly, no obvious combination of Atake and Easterflow would result in, or otherwise render obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the features recited in claims 16 or 22. Therefore, claim 22 is patentable over the combination of Atake and Easterflow.

Withdrawn claims 23 and 26-29 have been amended in a manner similar to claims 16 and 20-22. Therefore, it is submitted that withdrawn claims 23 and 26-29 are also allowable over the references. As a result, it is respectfully requested that withdrawn claims 23 and 26-29 receive due consideration and are also allowed.

Because of the above-mentioned distinctions, it is believed clear that claims 16, 20-22, 23, and 26-29 are allowable over the references relied upon in the rejections. Furthermore, it is submitted that the distinctions are such that a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention would not have been motivated to make any combination of the references of record in such a manner as to result in, or otherwise render obvious, the present invention as recited in claims 16, 20-22, 23, and 26-29. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 16, 20-22, 23, and 26-29 are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

In view of the above amendment and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. The examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that there are issues remaining which must be resolved before allowance of the application.

*The Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiency or to credit any overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 23-0975, with the EXCEPTION of deficiencies in fees for multiple dependent claims in new applications.*

Respectfully submitted,

Eiji FURUKAWA et al.

/Allen N. Doyel/

By: 2009.06.18 10:27:00 -04'00'

Allen N. Doyel  
Registration No. 60,391  
Agent for Applicants

AND/JRF/lkd  
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
June 18, 2009